



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                                                                                                       | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.         | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/733,850                                                                                                                            | 12/12/2003  | John Charles Calhoon | 5486-0143PUS1               | 9029                   |
| 67321 7590 07/12/2007<br>BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP<br>8110 GATEHOUSE ROAD<br>SUITE 100 EAST<br>FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>BERHANU, SAMUEL |                        |
|                                                                                                                                       |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2838            | PAPER NUMBER           |
|                                                                                                                                       |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>07/12/2007     | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

TH

|                              |                                      |                                       |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/733,850 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>CALHOON ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Samuel Berhanu    | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2838               |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8-15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 16, 17, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stephens (US 5,734,254) and in view of Remy Chevalier( Prius in the Wild, 1998).

Regarding Claim 16, Garcia et al disclose in Figures 2 and 3 a computer implemented method of providing inductive energy to a power adapter, comprising the step of: in a transmission element wirelessly receiving a polling message from a source (Column 2, lines 47-59); transmitting a request for power to the source via said transmission element (204) responsive to the polling message; and receiving inductive power from the source via said transmission element responsive to the transmitted request. (Noted that the receiving and the transmitting devices exchange data via a wireless communication means, when data is verified electrical action such as charging or providing energy executes). Garcia et al. do not disclose explicitly, converting the inductive power to a direct current; and outputting the direct current via a power port to a host device. However, Stephens discloses in Figures 2 and 3, converting the inductive power to a direct current (283); and outputting the direct current via a power port to a host device (290, outputting a DC signal to the electronic devices such as notebook

Art Unit: 2838

circuits, and also in Figure 2 Stephens shows a DC port to the device). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add an AC/DC converter in Garcia et. al. inductive charger apparatus as taught by Stephens in order to regulate the charging current for safety purpose and provide adjustable charging current for the battery, and further add a power connection means to distribute the charging current to different electronic devices . However, Garcia et al., and Stephens do not disclose explicitly, displaying an object on a graphical user interface, in response to the step of receiving, in order to visually indicate that external power is being received, wherein the displayed object visually differentiates between receiving inductive power and utility power; However, Chevalier discloses in page 2 that a computer screen that displays a type of power operating the vehicle. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use a computer screen with cool animation as taught by Chevalier in Garcia et al. apparatus in order to allow the user easily distinguish the power available to operate the device.

Regarding Claim17, Garcia et al. disclose the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting power parameters to the source (column 2, lines47-59).

Regarding Claim 19, Garcia et al. disclose, a step of initiating a charger responsive to the step of receiving (Column 2, lines 30-59).

Regarding Claim 21, Chevalier discloses on page 2, wherein the step of displaying an object on a graphical user interface includes displaying an icon.

Art Unit: 2838

3. Claims 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stephens (US 5,734,254) and in view of Remy Chevalier as applied to Claim 16 above, and further in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143).

Regarding Claim 18, Garcia et al., Stephens and Chevalier do not disclose, the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting authenticating data to the source. However, Stobbe discloses the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting authenticating data to the source. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Garcia et al. wireless battery charging system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted battery charging.

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stephens (US 5,734,254) and in view of Remy Chevalier as applied to Claim 16 above, and further in view of Parks et al. (US 5,455,466).

Regarding Claim 19, Garcia et al., Stephens and Chevalier do not disclose, a step of converting the inductive power to a direct current responsive to the step of receiving. However, Parks et al. disclose in Figure 1 a step of initiating a step of converting the inductive power to a direct current responsive to the step of receiving (Column 2, lines 35-50). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a charging rectifier circuit in Garcia et al wireless battery charging system as taught by Parks et al. in order to supply direct current appropriate for charging the battery pack.

Art Unit: 2838

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stephens (US 5,734,254) and in view of Remy Chevalier as applied to Claim 16 above, and further in view of Higuchi et al. (US 6,163,132).

Regarding Claim 20, Garcia et al., Stephens and Chevalier do not disclose, a step of transmitting data to a computer system for indicating the step of receiving inductive power. However, Higuchi et al disclose in Figures 1 and 2 a step of transmitting data to a computer system for indicating the step of receiving inductive power (Column 4, lines 33-38). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a computing and indicating system to the battery pack in Garcia et al. as taught by Higuchi et al. in order to monitor battery status.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 8-15 allowed.

8. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

For Claim 8: Primarily, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest in the claimed combination: wherein the processor unit is programmed to operate in a polling mode; a coil controlled by the processor unit to alternate between an energized and a de-energized state at regular intervals while in the polling mode and configured for receiving the inductive energy and for receiving inductive data

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel Berhanu whose telephone number is 571-272-8430. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Art Unit: 2838

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Karl Easthom can be reached on 571-272-1989. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SB

  
BAO Q. VU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER